

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is requested.

The applicants believe that the rejections under certain of the claims under §112 have been withdrawn as the Office Action of February 8, 2001 makes no mention thereof. The applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the withdrawal of the rejections under §112. It is also noted that the terminal disclaimer filed on December 11, 2000 has been accepted and recorded.

The applicants note that in paragraph 9 of the rejection dated February 8, 2001, the Examiner misconstrued the invention. Reference to the application at page 7, lines 14 to the end of the paragraph, clearly show that the language of the claims are defined in the specification sufficiently to overcome the Examiner's interpretation, which it is believed was incorrect. It is submitted that the language of the claims as presented adequately describe the invention such that all the advantages of the invention over the prior art are obtained. Moreover, it is submitted that the Examiner has misconstrued the difference between the prior art references and the invention and has failed to recognize the thermodynamic differences in surface reactions between a gas and a liquid taught in the references and the reactions which occur under the conditions taught by this application.

If the Examiner reconsiders the Homme U.S. patent no. 3,113,017, the Worthington U.S. patent no. 4,445,931 and the Evans U.S. patent no. 4,556,420, he will understand that none of the prior art remotely suggests or teaches the claimed invention. Otherwise, the applicants' response to the Final Office Action of February 8, 2001, is fully set forth in the response dated December 5, 2000, which is incorporated

herein by reference. It is believed that if the Examiner reconsiders the remarks of the response dated December 5, 2000 in light of the statements above and in light of the referenced portion of the application at page 7, line 14 to the end of the page, he will understand the nature of the invention and withdraw the rejections of the claims.

None of the prior art remotely shows or suggests the invention as claimed and the Examiner's misconception that the references relied upon show or suggest the claimed invention is erroneous. The applicants reiterate that they traverse each conclusion regarding obviousness or anticipation by the Examiner set forth in the February 8, 2001 final rejection.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully suggested that each of the claims remaining in this application is drawn to patentable subject matter and the allowance thereof is requested.

In the event that the Examiner is not persuaded by the reference to the application and the remarks herein, he is requested to call the undersigned so that a personal interview may be arranged.

March 30, 2001

Respectfully submitted,

Harry M. Levy, Esq.
Emrich & Dithmar
300 South Wacker Drive, Suite 3000
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Phone: (312)-663-9800


